



Congressional Record

United States
of AmericaPROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 115

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1969

No. 191

Senate

NOMINATIONS

The Senate met in executive session at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Thou has been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting Thou are God.—Psalm 90: 1 and 2.

O Lord, renew our knowledge of Thee and of Thy grace and providence. To those who mourn, give comfort; to those who are ill, send Thy healing grace; to the youthful voyagers in the vastness of Thy universe, give wisdom and courage; and to each of us here, give an awareness of Thy presence moment by moment, that as we live and work we may submit our lives to Thy higher judgment. In the name of Him who taught us to seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, November 18, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business as in legislative session be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in executive session I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The bill clerk read the nomination of Robert Coleman Gresham, of Maryland, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The bill clerk read the nomination of Caspar W. Weinberger, of California, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 4 or 5 minutes as in legislative session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. MILITARY BASES IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on U.S. Security Agreements has now made available the text of its initial hearings. This first release, a censored version of several sessions of executive hearings of Government witnesses, is focused on the military bases which are leased by the United States in the Republic of the Philippines.

The press of other Senate business prevented me from attending all but one

of the sessions, and that very briefly. As a member of the subcommittee, however, I have seen the full transcript, both before and after certain deletions were made.

For the record, it should be noted, that the executive branch requested a delay in publication of these hearings until after the general elections in the Philippines. That was a request to which I could and did fully subscribe because it seemed to me a most reasonable and responsible course for the Senate committee in the circumstances. The proposed delay was for but a few days, and it afforded the advantage of avoiding even a remote suggestion of an intrusion in the Philippine election.

Beyond that request for a delay, however, I made no proposal myself nor endorsed any proposal for the deletion of any material in these hearings on the Philippines for any purpose whatsoever. That any deletions are necessary in Senate hearings is always regrettable even though, in this instance, those involving security were unavoidable. In any event, so far as I am aware, the decisions on deletions were made solely by representatives of the executive branch and of the Foreign Relations Committee.

It seems to me that the committee's hearings brought together a great deal of useful information. The immense cost of the bases to the people of the United States, for example, is highly relevant to the work of the Senate. So, too, is what appears to be a superfluity in these installations in terms of reasonable utility. It is useful, too, that there be a Senate awareness of the great dimensions of this base complex, because from its vastness stems distortions in the country of location and in our relations with that country. The committee's investigation into these aspects of the U.S. base problem and the diplomatic complications which they pose was necessary and appropriate.

Moreover, it is to be anticipated that we will be confronted in the near future with the problem of renegotiating the base agreements with the Philippines. The hearings have made a distinct contribution to the Senate's understanding of what will be entailed in that process.

In recognizing these values, however, it should also be noted that matters were touched on in the course of the hearings—in some cases there were references

S 14597

to deprecating innuendoes and sensational rumors involving Government leaders, citizens, and internal Philippine affairs. These are matters which, in my judgment, did not fall within our responsibility and, in any case, tend to detract from the main purpose of the investigation. The record of the hearings, however, suggests a somewhat unintended involvement on the part of the committee in these matters as they pertain to the Philippines. Any such suggestion seems to me to be unfortunate in this instance, especially because the Philippines is now the oldest continuing free democracy in Southeast Asia. Its special link with the United States can be, if the relationship evolves in the context of co-operation and respect, an element of great reciprocal advantage as well as a factor of general stability in the western Pacific.

Lest the relationship be damaged through inadvertence, I think it would be well to emphasize for purposes of balance and perspective that every nation, our own included, has problems of violence and crime as well as imperfections in its institutions. It would be well to bear in mind, too, that the Philippines ceased to be an American colony in 1946, and that, while the newly formed Republic, in the wake of the great devastation which it suffered in World War II, counted heavily on promised help from the United States and the carryover of certain prewar dependent relationships, the situation has changed markedly. A quarter of a century later, the Philippines has moved a long way—a very long way—from these vestiges of the past. A social, political, and economic momentum has been generated on the basis of an awakened Filipino nationalism which, in my judgment, is authentic, dynamic and constructive.

It would be well to bear in mind, finally, that the U.S. military bases remain on Philippine soil by our design and desire as well as by the request of the Philippine Government. The bases are for the use and convenience of the U.S. Armed Forces and for the security of this Nation as well as for the security of the Philippines. To the extent that they are no longer mutually required—and I stress “mutually required”—adjustments can be made in existing arrangements and, by all means, they should be made without delay. It would be most unfortunate, however, if these and other adjustments in the relationship should be brought about in an atmosphere between the two nations which is disturbed by irrelevant hangovers from the past and avoidable misunderstandings in the present.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate messages from the House of Representatives on S. 2000, H.R. 7066, and Senate Joint Resolution 26.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE LYNDON B. JOHNSON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2000) to establish the Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in order to preserve in public ownership historically significant properties associated with the life of Lyndon B. Johnson, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, by donation or by purchase with donated funds, such lands and interests in lands, together with the buildings and improvements thereon, at or in the vicinity of Johnson City, Texas, as are depicted on the drawing entitled “Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site Boundary Map”, numbered NHS-LBJ-20,000 and dated September 1969, together with such lands as from time to time may be donated for addition to the site and such lands as he shall deem necessary to provide adequate public parking for visitors at a suitable location. The drawing shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. When acquired such site shall be known as the Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall administer the Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), as amended.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than \$180,000 to provide for the development of the Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7066) to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site, which was to amend section 11 of the act as amended by the Senate to read as follows:

That, in order to preserve in public ownership historically significant properties associated with the life of William Howard Taft, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, by donation or purchase with donated funds, such land and interests in land, together with buildings and improvements thereon and including scenic easements, at or in the vicinity of Auburn Ave-

nue, Cincinnati, Ohio, as are depicted on the drawing entitled “William Howard Taft National Historic Site Boundary Map”, numbered TAHO-20009, and dated August 1969. The drawing shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. When acquired such site shall be known as the William Howard Taft National Historic Site.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE EISENHOWER NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 26) to provide for the development of the Eisenhower National Historic Site at Gettysburg, Pa., and for other purposes, which were to strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert:

That there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than \$1,081,000 for the development of the Eisenhower National Historic Site at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, which may not be expended for the construction of major capital improvements as long as the special use permit issued to Mamie Doud Eisenhower by the National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, on June 3, 1969, remains in effect.

SEC. 2. There are hereby excluded from the boundaries of Gettysburg National Military Park, and included within the boundaries of the Eisenhower National Historic Site, the lands and interests therein identified as “Additions to Eisenhower NHS” on the drawing entitled “Proposed Additions to Eisenhower National Historic Site”, numbered EISE-20000 and dated June 1969, which is on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

And to strike out the preamble.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

CREDIT LIFE OVERCHARGE REACHES \$250 MILLION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the latest figures from Spectator magazine, an insurance industry trade publication, reveal that the credit life insurance industry overcharged the American consumer by \$250 million in 1968 compared to a \$225 million overcharge in 1967. Despite assurances given by industry spokesman that the States are beginning to protect consumers, the latest figures show just the opposite. The consumer is being socked even harder to the tune of one quarter of a billion dollars.

The overcharge on credit life insurance has been computed according to the formula developed by a former State insurance commissioner who first testified at congressional hearings in 1967. Each year the overcharge has steadily in-

DATE 30 Nov PAGE 1

U.S. COST TO GET THAI TO JOIN WAR PUT AT A BILLION

Deal Is Reported to Include
Equipment and Pay for
Division in Vietnam

PROGRAM BEGAN IN 1966

Bankok's List of Military
Needs Is Said to Include
Missiles and Jets

By RICHARD HALLORAN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 30—Informed Congressional sources said today that it had cost the United States about \$1-billion to obtain the deployment of a Thai division to fight in South Vietnam.

This is the price tag, the sources said, placed on a five-year arrangement that was negotiated with the Government of Thailand in 1965. The program began in 1966 and will run into 1971.

The arrangement included equipment, logistic support and financial payment for the Thai division in Vietnam as well as military assistance to the Thai armed forces in Thailand, and economic aid to the Bangkok Government.

List Was Presented

It also included a list of advanced military equipment presented to the United States by Thai military leaders. The United States agreed to furnish Thailand with Hawk missiles and F-5 jet fighter planes. United States military advisers in Thailand later discovered, the sources said, that the Thais could not use or maintain the weapons properly.

No breakdown in the cost of each component in the arrangement was available.

A State Department spokesman, asked to confirm the report, said that officials competent to discuss the question were unavailable today.

The sources also report that Robert S. McNamara, then Secretary of Defense, opposed the arrangement with Thailand on the ground that it was neither necessary nor economical. The sources said that Mr. McNamara, now president of the World Bank, had expressed his opposition in what one called "graphic language."

Rusk's View Won Out

The sources said Mr. McNamara's arguments were overcome by Dean Rusk, then Secretary of State. The sources said Mr. Rusk had agreed that the cost and the arrangement were irrational but that sometimes irrational commitments must be made for political and diplomatic reasons.

Mr. McNamara was not available for comment today. Mr. Rusk, reached by telephone, declined to comment.

The commitment of Thai, South Korean, Philippine, Australian and New Zealand troops to the war in Vietnam was often cited by the Administration of President Johnson as a sign of

Continued on Page 13, Column 1

American policy in Vietnam.

At their peak, the Thais had 12,000 troops in South Vietnam, the South Koreans over 50,000, the Philippines 2,200, the Australians 8,000, and the New Zealanders 500. This compares with a total of 550,000 from the United States, at the peak.

Several influential Senators, including J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, have been critical

of the United States' commitment to Thailand.

One sore point is a plan for military aid to Thailand drawn up by the Pentagon in 1965. Senator Fulbright has contended that it goes beyond formal American treaty commitments to Thailand. He has also quarreled with the Pentagon for refusing to deliver a copy of the secret plan to his committee. The Pentagon on Nov. 7 relented and gave a copy to the committee.

Similarly, several Senators have accused both the Johnson and Nixon Administrations of going beyond commitments approved by the Senate.

They point to a joint communiqué issued by Secretary of State Rusk and the Thai For-

eign Minister, Thanat Khoman, in 1962 and reaffirmed by Secretary of State William P. Rogers last May. It said that if the eight-nation Southeast Asia Treaty Organization failed to act against any aggressor, the United States could act to protect an Asian member without approval of the treaty organization.

A Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee chaired by Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri, has been inquiring into the nature and extent of American commitments in Asia and recently concluded hearings on commitments to Thailand.

Transcripts of those hearings, along with transcripts of hearings on commitments to Laos

and Taiwan, are being studied by subcommittee staff members and officials of the State Department, Defense Department, Central Intelligence Agency, and other government agencies to determine what can be made public. Publication of the transcripts on Thailand is not expected until after the first of the year.

On Nov. 18 the subcommittee published a censored transcript of its hearings on commitments to the Philippines. It showed that the United States had paid \$38-million to the Philippines for the services of a noncombatant construction battalion that engaged in civic action projects in Vietnam.

The Government of President

Ferdinand E. Marcos, who has ordered the battalion withdrawn from Vietnam, has strongly denied that it was paid anything—other than funds for equipment and support—to send the force to South Vietnam.

Senator Symington, noting reports of disagreement between the Philippine statement and testimony by American officials before his subcommittee, has asked the General Accounting Office to investigate. That office is a watchdog agency that reports to the Congress, not the Executive branch.

The accounting office has already completed an investigation into the five-year arrangement with Thailand. The

sources said that copies of the secret report were in the hands of several members of Congress.

A commitment similar to that made to Thailand is known to have been made to South Korea but the amount of money involved has so far been kept secret.